DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 467 SP 040 953

AUTHOR	Mahaffey, Cynthia
TITLE	A History of Empowerment and Critical Pedagogies.
PUB DATE	1999-04-00
NOTE	27p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Admission; Diversity (Student); English Instruction; Equal Education; Higher Education; Power Structure; Racial Factors; *Student Empowerment; Student Participation; Teaching Methods; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction; Writing Research; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	*Critical Pedagogy

ABSTRACT

This paper constructs a history of empowerment and critical pedagogies in U.S. composition studies, building on the idea that critical pedagogies arise out of social constructs and exigencies, and they are not divorced from the realities of students' academic concerns and growths. Primary sources for the paper are table of contents pages in "College Composition and Communication" (CCC), 1958-1997. CCC is one of the major journals for university first-year composition teachers. After defining relevant terms, the paper proposes a populist thesis for the social construction of empowerment and critical pedagogies: "It's all about power." It goes on to describe the Dartmouth Conference, a 1966 meeting of British and U.S. teachers and scholars to discuss the teaching of English in public schools. The paper looks at the issue of open admissions, then focuses on issues relevant to race and class. After discussing the beginning of empowerment strategies and the emergence of critical pedagogies, the article concludes that students deserve the power to appropriate their own education, to choose their own topics about what to write, and to assume the writerly authority that will lead to their own independence. (Contains 18 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 467

A History of Empowerment and Critical Pedagogies

By
Cynthia Mahaffey

With thanks to Dawn Gordon
For her generative ideas, which got me unstuck on this piece of work,
Her unfailing collegiality, and
Her East Coast sense of humor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cynthia Mahaffey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Bowling Green State University
April 1999

SP040953

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A History of Empowerment and Critical Pedagogies

Cynthia Mahaffey

A little thinking aloud about ethos

We had, on the campus of California State University of Fullerton, an old guy who wore a flag belt, like the kind color guards wear in parades, and in that flag belt, the biggest American flag on a pole I have ever seen carried by hand. Wearing an old navy blue suit, tie, white shirt, and scuffed shoes, this old man marched vigorously back and forth on the cement quadrangle, singing great hymns of the faith and of American civil religion loudly, interspersed with shouted Bible verses, his long, white hair flapping gently in the breeze. At the time I was an earnest 19 year old Christian, though I dressed like a hippie in nasty frayed cords, men's cowboy shirts, and as little as possible on my feet. I was standing, that morning in 1973, with a Navy vet who had just returned from Viet Nam. Ben was also a student, also a Christian, but was older, had seen a few things and had a calmer basic disposition.

"Look at that guy, Ben—he's a disgrace to Christianity! He's embarrassing."

"Cynthia, I've always felt that everyone is doing the best they can, with the information they have, at any given moment."

Ben's comment stopped me dead in my hypercritical tracks, and I've never forgotten his words. I, too, am older now, have seen a few things, and am now a "liberal" Anglican--and while I will never be like Ben, my disposition is calmer too. On many levels, when I think about what people do—things I think moronic, or questionable, or don't understand—I try to remember that "everyone is doing the best they can, with the information they have."

In my ten years of teaching, at both the high school and university levels, I have heard a variety of comments from "the public," people who are not educators, who share with me their views of American education:

- "These so-called trends in education are just fads. First we had phonics, then whole language, now we're back to phonics again. It's about a ten-year cycle."
- "Those folks in the ivory towers just think up things to write their dissertations on and don't think how teachers in our elementary schools are going to teach what they think up, or how our children will be affected."
- "My son/daughter came home at Thanksgiving break from college and told me his/her professor told them, "We will decide together what we will study." Doesn't that prof know what she wants to teach, or is she too lazy to write lessons?"

Despite these "public" perceptions of pedagogy, or perhaps because of them, I wish to propose the idea that in higher education, and specifically, in composition studies, that as teachers of writing, we are doing the best we can, given the information we have at any given moment. As teachers, we are aware of the specific contexts of our teaching, of the lives of our students, of the academic writing needs of our students, of expectations of our university administrations for required writing outcomes, and of constraints and expectations of the English departments of which we are members. We are aware, too, of public and media perceptions of our task, often stated in terms of the giving or rescinding of government funding for our universities and for our writing programs.

It is in the context of this awareness and the idea, that, for the most part, as writing teachers we are doing the best we can, that I wish to construct a history of empowerment and critical pedagogies in American composition studies. While this may sound like an exclusion of critique, it is not. I just wish to build the idea that pedagogies arise out of social constructs and exigencies, that they are not divorced from the realities of students' academic concerns and needs.

Methodology

Using definitions of empowerment and critical pedagogies crafted by theorists and teachers central to these approaches as organizing themes, I want to show their socially constructed place in the history of American composition studies. Primary source materials for this project will be Table of Contents pages in College Composition and Communication, 1958-1997. CCC is one of the major journals for university first-year composition teachers and the "house organ" for the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the major organization for composition teachers and

studies. These specific years were chosen because the Dartmouth Conference of 1966 marks an important shift, according to Berlin, from linguistic approaches to the teaching of writing to more expressive approaches (149). Further, the range of years allows a look at what was being written and discussed as the liberatory pedagogies of Paulo Freire and his American interpreters—Ira Shor, Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux, and others—began implementation in first-year composition courses. While it can (and has) been argued that such journals are representative of the "oppressors," and their editors act as "gatekeepers" for the profession in terms of what work is deemed scholarly, and thus privileged, and what work is deemed "unscholarly," and therefore marginalized, I'll stay with my perhaps naïve assumption that even they are doing the best they can, particularly since the editorship of CCC has probably never been a get-rich-quick scheme. I'll assume that the articles listed on these pages are fairly representative of the thinking and teaching and writing among compositionists of the time.

During these same early years, the effect of open admissions policies of colleges in New York on the teaching of composition is also an important factor in the use of emancipatory pedagogies. For the first time, university professors of writing were faced with students who were, in every sense, non-traditional—women and men of color, poor, underprepared, older, working, parents, working-class. The Viet Nam conflict also began in these early years—American involvement began as early as 1960-61-- as well as the Civil Rights movement—and the political actions surrounding these extended to students' desire for freedom in many aspects of their lives, including what they learned in college.

The later years are included as a way of illustrating the forms liberatory pedagogies, and then critical pedagogies, took in composition studies and in first-year

composition courses. Issues of difference—race, ethnicity, and gender in the early years of emancipatory pedagogies—are revisited and reconstructed in later years to include class and sexual orientation, and to envision a shift in understanding from difference as victimization to a stance of difference as identity. Additionally, the years most recent show, I think, how these pedagogies are currently being critiqued.

Definitions

I will use the terms "liberatory", "empowerment," and "emancipatory" to refer to those educational theorists (Freire, Giroux, McLaren, and Shor) and classroom practices (hooks and Berlak) which seek to place responsibility and authority for students' education in their hands, which call for decentering of teacher authority, follow inquiry-based, student-generated methodologies and work toward negotiated curricula.

In Freire's 1970 book, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, teachers and students are co-learners in the inquiry process; each teaches the other. For Freire, this "reconciling" on inequitable subject positions is crucial to the students' and teachers' ability to be transformed in their education. If the teacher retains her/his position of power in the classroom, s/he is reproducing the oppression of our culture, and reducing the chance of both teacher and students for critical thinking. For Freire, "liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferals of information" (60). This kind of thinking happens through "problem-posing," in which students ask real questions and work together with the teacher to make knowledgeable answers.

Shor and Freire, in 1987, reinscribe the Freirean agenda and definitions for American composition studies. Liberatory education includes: the politics of teacher and student situatedness in the classroom, students' ability to make knowledge when

authority is decentered, education as a "political act" (13), the necessity of student resistance, negotiated learning and curriculum as empowering for students and teacher, and the central place of teacher-student dialogue.

Villanueva, in 1991, advocates the acknowledgement and articulation, with students, of the forces of hegemony in their lives, in teachers' lives, in their education, and in their university settings. At the same time, he argues against teachers who subordinate students' own expectations and desires for their educational to their, the teachers', political agendas. In this way, Villanueva, in his own words, a "Freirista," stands against some of the concerns of critical theorists.

Women's studies theorists—Ellsworth, Gore and Lather—draw helpful distinctions among strands of thought in feminist, critical, and empowerment discourses in three important articles appearing in 1992. Ellsworth argues that "key assumptions, goals and pedagogical practices fundamental to the literature on critical pedagogy—namely, "empowerment," "student voice," "dialogue," and even the term "critical" are repressive myths that perpetuate relations of dominance" (91). She notes that when she and her students attempted to activate these goals in a course she taught in response to incidents of racism at her own university, the problems of "Eurocentrism, racism, sexism, classism, and "banking education" worsened rather than resolved (91). Further, Ellsworth charges that proponents of critical pedagogies have not shown whether their practices actually change power relationships "outside or inside schools," that these pedagogies often seek public funding for personal agendas, and that "code words" are used which mask their subversive stances (93). She problematizes student voice as "partial and partisan," while "taking them at their word": "...they hold implications other

social movements and their struggles for self-definition" (97). Ellsworth interrogates also the assumptions of empowerment with regard to teacher-student subject positions, noting that in many Freirean theorists, the teacher, covertly or overtly, holds the power, and shares with his/her students, implying the superiority of the teacher. An important critique here, too, is Ellsworth's argument that empowerment projects have removed teachers and students from their historical and political contexts, which clouds the reality that our own prejudices and agendas oppress both others and us.

Lather defines "critical pedagogy" as "that which attends to practices of teaching/learning intended to interrupt particular historical, situated systems of oppression" (121). She claims that these pedagogies have too often not problematized empowerment as "something done…"to" or "for" the as-yet-unliberated, the "Other" (122). Her discussion is contextualized in a historical discussion of liberatory discourses and what she terms "post-critical pedagogies" (122), centering on an analysis of Ellsworth's "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy." Ellsworth's strength, according to Lather, is her postmodern reflection about pedagogical theory and practice: "Making the workings of pedagogy more apparent," the possibilities for finding truly liberatory practices are increased (127). "Post-critical pedagogies" seek to shift the emphasis from, in Alcoff's words, "speaking for others" to reflexively examining their own conflicts and sites of resistance (131).

Gore offers a useful examination of definitions of "empowerment" in a variety of discourses—she labels these as "conservative," "liberal humanist," and "critical and feminist" (54)—which also argues the relationship between "empowerment and

pedagogy" (55). Gore delineates two distinct "approaches to the question of pedagogy…one strand emphasizes the broad (and shifting) social and educational vision while the other shows greater concern for instructional practices in specific contexts" (55). [This distinction is reflected, by the way, in the CCC Tables of Contents pages]. She puts Giroux and McLaren in the first category, and Freire and Shor in the second. Similarly, Gore presents two schools in feminist pedagogy, those emerging in Women's Studies and those form education. For Gore, within these various discourses and pedagogies,"empowerment presupposes":

> (1) an agent of empowerment, (2) a notion of power are property, and (3) some kind of vision or desirable end state. (56)

Gore critiques the agency of teacher as "empower-er," noting our situation within contexts of patriarchy (e.g. university settings) and by the "historical construction of pedagogy as, and within, discourses of social regulation" (57). She also critiques what she views as Giroux's establishment of a binary between teachers and students which "others" students. Gore posits that much of empowerment theory has served to empower academics, rather than students (68).

In 1994, bell hooks acknowledges her indebtedness to the work and person of Freire in her discussion of a "liberatory pedagogy." For hooks, such pedagogy consists in disrupting educational practices, which allow only one way of knowledge-making, in which the teacher is the gatekeeper to knowledge-production. This aligns her, at least in this one aspect, with critical theorists, who would encourage students to interrogate their own education. The teacher, for hooks, is one engaged in her/his own process of "self-actualization," crucial if the classroom is really intended as a "safe" site for "education as

the practice of freedom." hooks also posits that the feminist classroom frees students from replicating the inequities of power endemic in our society, and allows the "construction of an identity in resistance" (46).

The term "critical pedagogies" is meant to describe the work of later theorists—Berlak, Ellsworth, Malinowitz, Gore and others—who critique empowerment pedagogies for the ways in which these approaches serve to further "othering" and entrenchment if superficial student perceptions of difference, and fail to articulate the substantive issues of difference. Truly critical pedagogies, argue Lather, Villanueva, and Malinowitz, empower students in their recognition of the political exigencies of students' lives and the political and institutional constraints on teachers. "Critical", for these theorists, applies to pedagogies that articulate the need for transformation of power structures both within and without the academy as recognition of the inequitable ways education and other societal structures limit and disempower students. In the classroom, critical pedagogies often take on issues of gender, race, class, and sexual orientation as a means of interrogating students' assumptions and formulas.

Berlak, in 1994, articulates the goals of a pedagogy that seeks, through the deconstruction of race and racism, students' increased understanding of their own subject positions with regard to oppression. In turn, Berlak's course examines, as social constructs of oppression, "racism, sexism, heterosexism, adultism, and anti-Semitism" (41). Berlak notes that this approach, which was effected to enable students to "cross areas of difference," served both to perpetuate and to liberate students from those differences. By foregrounding each social construct, Berlak feels that students' labels became more deeply ingrained, rather than freeing them to understand each other's

positions. In assuming a "critical pedagogy" stance toward her own critical pedagogy, Berlak illustrates both the possibilities and limitations of a truly "critical" pedagogy in terms of student learning.

Ellsworth, writing from an educational foundations viewpoint in 1994, addresses important concerns for critical pedagogies. For example, how does "speaking about" marginalized groups lead to "speaking for" them? (105). How does that "speaking for," in turn, affect the subject relations between teachers and students, and the learnings that occur, both overt and covert?

She uses the term "representation" to illuminate the ways in which teacher and student subject position are constructed through "curriculums, teaching practices, and school policies" (105). "Representation"—the "processes that people and social groups use to interpret and give meaning to the world, and to the mediation of those meanings by and through language, stories, images, music, and other cultural products" (100)—as social construct (rather than as essentialist) speaks to questions not only about privileged and marginalized populations, but also to privileged and marginalized bodies of knowledge. [This idea becomes important later in the history of the CCC Table of Contents pages when Writing Across the Curriculum becomes a central approach in composition studies].

Malinowitz, in 1995, constructs a critical pedagogy in which gay and lesbian students can "confront the ways that they function as social metaphors for their audience...classroom peers and teachers," that acknowledges rather than silences these students' choice for an openly gay subjectivity. Through an "identity" themed course, both gay and lesbian and straight students are given space to construct, through their

writing, an understanding of their own and others' subject positions. Malinowitz argues that such a pedagogy, which foregrounds a queer, rather than "mainstream" discourse, offers lesbian and gay students the opportunity to "[write] different texts, [be] different sorts of readers, [be] differently constituted as audiences, [have] different sorts of intertextual relationships with their peers' writing" (144). In this way, Malinowitz combines both liberatory and critical approaches—gay and lesbian students are empowered to write from an openly gay subjectivity—**not**, admittedly, a common stance in composition classrooms—and, at the same time, encouraged to critique that subjectivity.

McLaren, in 1996, posits the transformative possibilities of pedagogy as a "form of social and cultural criticism" (125). For McLaren, the teacher's subject position is necessarily a politicized one: "the role of the educator [is] as an active agent of social change" (125). Teachers must recognize that language practices—a central theme for those of us in composition studies—implicate us in the oppressive discursive practices of our culture. Like hooks, Mclaren argues that if we do not disrupt or challenge the ways in which these practices oppress students' means of knowledge production, we also oppress. True liberatory/critical (for he collapses the meanings), for McLaren is articulated through a "politics of difference," illuminated through dialogue (143).

In 1997, Giroux posits that schools are sites of contested power and ideology, which a critical pedagogy should articulate and transform. He cites the work of Mikhail Bahktin and Paulo Freire as the theoretical basis for a model "in which the notions of struggles, student voice and critical dialogue are central to the goal of developing an emancipatory [Giroux also collapses the definitions] pedagogy" (132). Subject positions

of both teacher and students are directly related to and mediated by the way language is infected with power relations. Giroux would have us investigate how the power relations which oppress in our society are reflected in our school practices ("discourse of production"), develop "critique capable of analyzing cultural forms as they are produced and used in specific classrooms" ("discourse of textual analysis"), and examine how both students and teachers make meaning in our historical/cultural contexts ("the discourse of lived cultures") (134-140).

"Meet me at the confluence"

I'd like to propose a populist thesis for the social construction of empowerment and critical pedagogies: "It's all about power." The 1950's were about the power struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union, a Cold War ideology that revolved around ideas of domination, Communist conspiracies, black lists, nuclear holocausts—great governments lined up on opposite sides of a chasm with warheads pointed at each other, powerful fingers poised over Doomsday red buttons.

The concerns of writing teachers and composition scholars in the late 1950's both reflect an awareness of cultural contexts for the work of composition as well as the influence of linguistics. Norman Cliff, in the February, 1958 issue of CCC, was evidently busy counting: "Intensive Adverbs from a Quantitative Point of View." Edgar Mayer discusses "Linguistics and the Second Language," and Morris Freedman, "The Seven Sins of Technical Writing." Composition program leaders were concerned, as we still are now, about "covering the classes"—George S. Wycoff examines "Current Solutions for Teaching Maximum Numbers with Limited Faculty" (May 1958) and a panel at the 1958 annual convention discusses "Administering the Large Freshman

Program" (Oct. 1958). And while we talk these days about scholarship on pedagogy as less valorized than theory, there were hardy souls like Fred Dudley et al, "Composition for Gifted Freshmen" (Feb. 1958), MacCurdy Burnett's "Differential Methodologies for Freshmen" (May 1958).

Chinks in the armor were beginning to appear. Marshall McLuhan, surprisingly, publishes an essay on the "Speed of Cultural Change" (Feb. 1958) and Ronald Cutler, looking forward to expressive writing assignments, authors, "The Autobiography as Creative Writing" (Feb. 1958). Harry R. Warfel begins to approach the inner life of the student with "Acquiring Helpful Attitudes Toward Writing" (Dec. 1958). John E. Bellamy proposes to integrate popular culture: "Teaching Composition By Television" (Feb. 1960).

In the 1960's those world powers still faced off, but power also permeated every level of American society. The United States, in the name of fending off Communist domination, entered an Asian conflict that occupied us as the Viet Nam War for the next nearly 20 years. As it became increasingly clear that our government was sending our "poor and disenfranchised" to be killed as cannon fodder in a war against other peoples of color across the world, also poor and disenfranchised, American college students began protesting our country's involvement in Viet Nam. College presidents' offices and ROTC buildings were occupied, draft cards, American flags, and were burned, while Vietnamese Buddhist monks and American students immolated themselves.

The Civil Rights movement enacted discussions of power in civil disobedience, in public marches, in Supreme Court legislation. Radical black groups advanced agendas of

black power, black separatism, and black pride. More moderate groups sought power through the right to vote, through education, and by demanding equal rights for work, pay, and housing.

Other marginalized groups organized for power during this time, too. The Malachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis, social organizations for, respectively, gay men and lesbians, began to emerge from the closet and picket the White House, speak to the press, and publish their own newspapers. Hispanic peoples began political organizations around issues of migrant workers' rights, immigration and citizenship laws, and literacy.

In the field of composition studies, articles appeared reflecting the presence of "remedial" and "underprepared students", though not, apparently, at the University of Illinois—Harris Wilson examines "The Elimination of Remedial English at Illinois" ((May 1961). Panel reports at the 1961 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) include "New Attacks on the Problem of the Unprepared Freshman" and "The Freshman Whose Native Language is Not English". A workshop on "Preparation in Composition Course Needed by the Secondary School Teacher" seems to lay the blame for underprepared freshmen at the feet of high school teachers (Oct. 1961).

In the years immediately prior to the Dartmouth Conference, interest is building in more expressive modes of writing, and on students claiming their education. S. I. Hayakawa weighs in with "Learning to Think and To Write," while McKay Sundwall authors "The Feeling of Excitement" (Feb. 1962). In the February, 1963 issue, entitled "The Campus as Classroom," the profession embraces the culture of the college and American culture. Ken Macrorie writes, "Spitting on the Campus Newspaper" and

Jacqueline Berke tries an integrated approach, "The Campus Literary Magazine and Composition." Richard Hauer Costa authors "A Summer's Dilemma: Freshmen on Trial," while Burnham Carter, Jr. discusses "President Kennedy's Inaugural Address."

The Dartmouth Conference and Open Admissions

By 1964, Janet Emig writes "The Uses of the Unconscious in Composing", signaling an increasing interest in and cross-pollination with cognitive and depth psychologies and composition. In the same issue (Feb. 1964), Margaret Blanchard authors "Composition, Literature and Interior Powers." As Berlin notes,

> Throughout the sixties, essays arguing for writing as self-expression continue to appear, moving, as might be expected, in increasingly original directions. This method of writing was encouraged by the Dartmouth Conference, a meeting in 1966 of teachers and scholars from the United States and Britain...to discuss the teaching of English in the public schools. The emphasis in John Dixon's report on the conference, *Growth through English*, is on language and personal growth, the use of English studies for building an inner world (149).

The Dartmouth Conference did not, apparently have an immediate effect on the scholarly interests of CCC (or perhaps its lead-time did not allow it to). In 1967, transformational grammar is the topic: "The Value of Transformational Grammar in Teaching Composition", by Mark Lester, "Grammar Can Help in Composition Courses", by Ralph B. Long, appear in the December, 1967 issue, along with articles on "Argument in Nineteenth Century American Rhetoric Textbooks" (A.M. Tibbetts) and "A Successful Research Paper for College Freshmen" (Herman A. Estrin).

By 1968, composition teachers and scholars were beginning to face the realities of open admissions policies. Mina Shaughnessy writes, in Errors and Expectations,

> Toward the end of the sixties and largely in response to the protests of that decade, many four-year colleges began admitting students who were not by traditional standards ready for college. The numbers of such students varied from college to college as did the commitment to the task of teaching them (1)...In the spring of 1970, the City University of New York adopted an admissions policy that guaranteed to every city resident with a high school diploma a place in one of its eighteen tuition free colleges, thereby opening its doors...to a wider range of students than any college had probably ever admitted or thought of admitting to its campus—academic winners and losers from the best and worst high schools in the country, the children of the lettered and the illiterate, the blue-collared, the white-collared and the unemployed...reflecting that city's intense, troubled version of America (1-2).

As early as 1968, CCC began publishing articles that attempted to meet the needs of teachers whose students Shaughnessy here describes. In the December, 1968 issue, Sarah Webster Fabio asks, "What is Black?" and James A. Banks discusses "A Profile of the Black American: Implications for Teaching." David P. Demarest, Jr. investigates the "Freedom to Write: A Composition Course for Ghetto Adults." Lorraine Misiaszek writes "A Profile of the American Indian: Implications for Teaching" and Leonard Greenbaum, "Prejudice and Purpose in Compensatory Education."

Min-Zhan Lu much later critiques what she calls the "politics of linguistic innocence" of Shaughnessy and her contemporaries in composition, and it seems

important to point out here, as it will be relevant later, that Shaugnessy understood her students as desirous of acquiring the skills necessary to academic success, to enter the field of public discourse and career advancement. What might appear as the "othering" of marginalized students, from our stance in critical pedagogies years down the road, seems a culturally sensitive construct raised to meet the students' desires and wishes. Shaughnessy et al were "doing the best they could", acting in a socio-historical context, with both student and administrative exigencies, to teach students for academic success.

"Finding Your Own Voice"

By 1969, CCC had caught up with the Dartmouth Conference. One of the primary themes of expressive rhetoric and of empowerment pedagogy emerges in Donald M. Murray's "Finding Your Own Voice: Teaching Composition in an Age of Dissent" (May 1969). Marie Jean Lederman writes on "Hip Language and Urban College English" (Oct. 1969). Marjorie N. Murphy examines "Silence, the Word, and Indian Rhetoric" (Dec. 1970).

Issues of race and class also begin appearing. Robert H. Swennes asks, 'Can White Liberals Teach Black English in Negro Colleges in the South?" (Dec. 1969) and Jacqueline Griffin offers a practical look at "Remedial Composition at an Open-Door College" (Dec. 1969). Marian Musgrave interrogates "Failing Minoryt Students: Class, Caste, and Racial Bias in American Colleges" (Feb. 1971).

Forays into creativity and psychology, central to expressivists' concerns, are emerging. Donald M. Murray examines "The Interior View: One Writer's Philosophy of Composition" (Feb. 1970), and Richard Lloyd Jones, "Theoretical Problems in Studying Creativity and Composition" (Oct. 1970). Grace McLaughlin, in the same issue as Jones'

piece, relates "An Experiment in Translating Experience into Abstraction." And while I was in college in 1971, I wish I had been in William D. Lutz's class, "Making Freshman English a Happening" (Feb. 1971).

Getting relevant: The beginning of empowerment strategies

Rumblings of student demands for composition classes in which they have a say surface in Carl Perrin's "Teaching Composition to the "Now" Generation" (Oct. 1971) and Edythe M. Hall's "Achieving Relevance in Freshman Composition" (Feb. 1972). Rhetoric articles of this time also reflect issues of relevance: Hans P. Guth writes on "The Politics of Rhetoric" (Feb. 1972) and Robert F. Drinan, on "The Rhetoric of Peace" (Oct. 1972).

Scholarly interest in the "languages of the Other" include Michael D. Linn's "Black Rhetorical Patterns and the Teaching of Composition" and Marilyn Sternglass's "Dialect Literature: Positive Reinforcer for Writing "In" and "out" of Dialect", both in the May, 1975 issue. That "Other" includes women: Carol Weiher writes on"Sexism in Language and Sex Differences in Language Usage: Which Is More Important?" (Oct. 1976)

Richard C. Gebhardt and Barbara Genelle Smith pick up empowerment themes in ""Liberation" is Not "License": The Case for Self-Awareness through Writing" (Feb. 1976), but Mina Shaughnessy publishes her famous "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing" in October, 1976. It is not until December, 1978 that CCC authors return from the land of compensatory education to even expressivist approaches. Karen Spear, in that issue, addresses "Psychotherapy and Composition: Effective Teaching Beyond

Methodology" and Robert de Beaugrande, in Feb. 1979, "Psychology and Composition." This cross-disciplinary interest in psychology fueled ideas of "self" which expressivist, and later, empowerment theorists attached to student writing.

Examination of the Table of Contents pages from 1977, the year of Mina Shaughnessy's death, reveal the significance of her influence on the profession. Much of the work of this period, through at least 1982, returns to the problems of underprepared writers, to remedial English programs and to close examinations of grammar. In May, 1982, Lil Brannon and C. H. Knoblauch write "On Students' Rights to Their Own Texts: A Model of Teacher Response" and Donald M. Murray, "Teaching the Other Self: The Writer's First Reader."

For two more years, attention returns to articles on writing and the world of work, on process pedagogies (which, it might be noted, were, in their own way, empowerment pedagogies). In October 1984, the streams of expressive and empowerment pedagogies return to the surface in George H. Jensen's "Personality and Individual Writing Processes" and "Student Writers and Their Sense of Authority over Texts," Carol Berkenkotter. Diana George includes in this same issue an article on "Working With Peer Groups in the Composition Classroom." Students are beginning to claim a place in the work of the classroom.

Another "empowerment" pedagogy emerges in 1985, in an issue devoted to Writing Across the Curriculum. A.M. Wilkinson offers "A Freshman Writing Course in Parallel with a Science Course" and Chris Madigan writes on "Improving Writing Assignments with Communication Theory" (May, 1985). While later theorists, like Malinowitz and Herndl, have critiqued the positivist assumptions of WAC approaches,

the attempts at WAC in the 1980's and since have argued for its ability to teach students disciplinary knowledge and conventions which will prepare them for further academic work and for professional careers.

Critical pedagogies emerge

The concerns of WAC and remedial students continue in CCC until 1987, , when Kathleen E. Welch writes on "Ideology and Freshman Textbook Production: The Place of Theory in Writing Pedagogy" (Oct. 1987). In 1988, Geoffrey Chase writes "Accommodation, Resistance and the Politics of Student Writing" (Feb. 1988). Myron Tuman, in the same issue, examines "Class, Codes, and Composition: Basil Bernstein and the Critique of Pedagogy."

Things are beginning to pick up now, for critical pedagogies. Terry Dean addresses "Multicultural Classrooms, Monocultural Teachers" (Feb. 1989). In the May, 1989 issue, Joy Ritchie discusses "Beginning Writers; Diverse Voices and Individual Identity," a different stance to issues of difference in writing. Ann Murphy adds "Transference and Resistance in the Basic Writing Classroom: Problematics and Praxis."

Critical pedagogies' inclusion of issues of politics and identity begin emerging. Fan Shen writes on "The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition" (Dec. 1989) and Andrea Lunsford, on "Composing Ourselves: Politics, Commitment and the Teaching of Writing" (Feb. 1990).

Feminist concerns appear in Elizabeth Flynn's "Composing as a Woman" in December, 1988. Three years pass before another article appears, Catherine Lamb's "Beyond Argument in Feminist Composition" (Feb. 1991). Janice Wolff authors "Writing Passionately: Student Resistance to Feminist Readings" (Dec. 1991). Terry

Myers Zawacki writes, "Recomposing as a Woman—An Essay in Different Voices" (Feb. 1992). Karyn Hollis looks at "Feminism in Writing Workshops: A New Pedagogy" and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, at "Discourse and Diversity: Experimental Writing in the Academy" (both in October 1992). In the May 1994 issue, Cheryl Glenn recovers Aspasia in "sex, lies and manuscript: Refiguring Aspasia in the History of Rhetoric." In the same issue, C. Jan Swearingen addresses "Women's Ways of Writing, Or, Images, Self-Images, and Graven Images." JoAnn Campbell, reaching back for expressivist themes, produces "Writing to heal: Using Meditation in the Writing Process."

In the May, 1992 issue, the concerns of critical pedagogies appear again. Maxine Hairston examines "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." Donald Lazere offers "Teaching the Political Conflicts: A Rhetorical Schema," and Nina Chordas, "Classrooms, Pedagogies, and the Rhetoric of Equality." Gail Stygall authors "Resisting Privilege: Basic Writing and Foucault's Author Function" (Oct. 1994) Min-Zhan Lu, in December, 1994, writes "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone" and Cynthia Selfe and Richard Selfe, in the same issue, address "The Politics of the Interface: Power and Its Exercise in Electronic Contact Zones."

Recent articles examine issues of difference. The May 1995 issue includes Janis Haswell and Richard Haswell's "Gendership and the Miswriting of Students," Kathleen Dixon's "Gendering the "Personal," and Gerald Graff's "Conflict Pedagogy and Student Experience." Elizabeth Flynn, in October, 1995, examines "Feminism and Scientism."

Newer "empowerment" pedagogies are emerging too: Stephen M. Fishman and Lucille Parkman McCarthy's "Teaching for Student Change: A Deweyan Alternative to Radical Pedagogy"and Donald McAndrew's "Ecofeminism and the Teaching of

Literacy" (both in Oct. 1996). In February, 1997, Lester Faigley writes "Literacy After the Revolution" and Dennis A. Lynch, Diana George, and Marilyn M. Cooper, "Moments of Argument: Agonistic Inquiry and Confrontational Cooperation." Virginia Anderson discusses "Confrontational Teaching and Rhetorical Practice" (May 1997). Finally, in October 1997, Francis Sullivan et al. write on "Student Needs and Strong Composition: The Dialectics of Writing Program Reform."

Now that you're tired...

My hope, after doing this exhaustive (and exhausting) tracing of the streams of empowerment and critical pedagogies, that you, patient reader, will have a clearer picture of the social constructs these pedagogies have inhabited. The articles on these pedagogies are far outweighed, in College Composition and Communication, over this nearly 30-year span, by those on the needs of basic writers. It could be argued that empowerment and critical pedagogies have become less useful in recent years, or were, in fact, less useful all along, then those pedagogies which sought, and still seek to address the real writing needs of real writing students.

Entering university students come to our composition classes with their own individual agendas, most of which have a common stream—that they "pass ENG111 and 112." "Passing" for these students may have multiple meanings, but at bottom, my guess is that most students wish to present themselves intelligently in writing to their other teachers, to their employers, to their friends and lovers. The professors of other disciplines in the university wish us, in one or two semesters, to turn out writers who have skills that will enable them to address writing tasks in their classes. To my mind, this is a reasonable request. The University administration, I am certain, wishes this too.

These are the exigencies that meet me as a composition instructor. While I recognize the call of cultural studies and critical pedagogies for students to learn to think critically about what they learn, I wonder if that cannot happen in WAC approaches, or in skills-based classrooms. Students do deserve the power to appropriate their own education, to choose their own topics about which to write, and to assume the writerly authority that will lead to their own independence. The deserve to do it on their own terms, including the right to ask us, as composition teachers, to teach them the skills they need to succeed in their university and professional careers.

Works Cited

Berlak, Ann. "Antiracist Pedagogy in a College Classroom: Mutual Recognition and a Logic of Paradox." Inside/Out: Contemporary Critical Perspectives in Education. Ed. Rebecca A. Martusewicz and William M. Reynolds. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994. 37-60.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy." Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy. Ed. Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore. New York: Routledge, 1992. 90-119.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. "Representation, Self-Representation, and the Meanings of Difference: Questions for Educators." Inside/Out: Contemporary Critical Perspectives in Education. Ed. Rebecca A. Martusewicz and William M. Reynolds. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994. 99-108.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum, 1970. 52-81.

Giroux, Henry A. "Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom." Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture and Schooling. Boulder, CO: Westview Press/Harper Collins, 1997. 119-182.

Gore, Jennifer. "What Can We Do For You! What *Can* "We" Do For "You"? Struggling over Empowerment in Critical and Feminist Pedagogy." Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy. Ed. Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore, 1992. New York: Routledge, 1992. 54-73.

Herndl, Carl. "Teaching Discourse and Reproducing Culture: A Critique of research and Pedagogy in Professional and Non-Academic Writing." College Composition and Communication 44:3 (October 1993):349-363.

hooks, bell. Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Price of Freedom. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Lather, Patti. "Post-Critical Pedagogies: A Feminist Reading." Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy. New York: Routledge, 1992. 120-137.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Redefining the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy: A Critique of the Politics of Linguistic Innocence." Journal of Basic Writing 10:1 (Spring 1991): 327-37.

Malinowitz, Harriet. "A Feminist Critique of Writing in the Disciplines." Feminism and Composition: In Other Words. Eds. Susan Jarratt and Lynn Worsham. New York: Modern Language Association, 1997. 291-312.

Malinowitz, Harriet. "The Rhetoric of Empowerment in Writing Programs." Rhetoric, Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries. Ed. William Covino and David Jolliffe. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995.679-689.

Malinowitz, Harriet. Textual Orientations: Lesbian and Gay Students and the Making of Discourse Communities. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1995.

McLaren, Peter. "Liberatory Politics and Higher Education: A Freirean Perspective." Counternarratives: Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogies in Postmodern Spaces. Ed. Henry Giroux, Colin Lanskhear, Peter McLaren and Michael Peters. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Shaughnessy, Mina P. Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

"Table of Contents." College Composition and Communication. 1958-1997.

Shor, Ira. Ed. Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook/Heineman, 1987.

Villaneuna, Victor, Jr. "Considerations for American Freiristas." The Politics of Writing Instruction. Ed. Richard Bullock and John Trimbur. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cok/Heineman, 1991. 247-262.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: A History of Empowerment and Critical Pedagogies	
Author(s): Cynthia Jo MAHAFFEY (Mahaffey)	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: unpublished study

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Cynthia Jo Mahaffey SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☐	Cynthia Jo Mahaffey ☑	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproductio and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Cynthia Jo Mahaffey	Printed Name/Position/Title: Cynthia Jo Mahaffey, Instructor of English	
Organization/Address: Bowling Green State University CLC/HHARS 139 Bowling Green, OH 43402	Telephone: (419)372-0579	Fax: (419)372-8020
	E-mail Address: mahaffc@bgnet.bgsu.edu	Date: 5/17/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: